

**CIP Advisory Group (CAG) Meeting Minutes**  
**Sheraton Boston Hotel, Conference Room 7**  
**Saturday, January 15, 2005**  
**9:30-11:30 a.m.**

Attendees:

John Celli, Facilitator; David Bucknum, Gene Kinnaly, David Williamson, Library of Congress; Susan Bailey, Emory University; Bryan Baldus, Quality Books Inc.; Paul Bernabeo, Marshall Cavendish; Karen Calhoun, Cornell University; Andrew Grabois, R.R. Bowker; Emily Hicks, University of Dayton; Alice Jacobs, National Library of Medicine; Arlene Klair, University of Maryland; Janet Peterson, World Book, Inc.; Marti Scheel, National Library of Medicine; Sara Shatford Layne, UCLA Library Cataloging & Metadata Center; Andrea Stamm, Northwestern University Library; Doug Storer, The Library Corporation; Michelle Turvey, Kansas State University; Cynthia Whitacre, OCLC.

1. CIP Annual Report highlights

- Total of participating ECIP publishers increased to 3,212
- ECIP accounted for 55% of all titles receiving CIP Data
- Total CIP production = 53,349 titles
- We may make January 2006 the date when CIP switches to ECIP. Possible exceptions:
  - a) Books with non-European diacritics
  - b) Books with extensive chemical, mathematical formulas
  - c) Other categories to be determined
- Must move to ECIP because:
  - a) Reduced staffing levels
  - b) Ability to handle European diacritics in ECIP
  - c) Improved efficiency in ECIP due to enhancements in TCEC (Text Capture and Electronic Conversion)
  - d) First two months of FY2005 ECIP production was 60%
  - e) Mail delivery slow even for commercial carriers
- CIP throughput averages 12.7 calendar days with 78% within 14 days
- CIP Division processed over 204,000 books (CIP, PCN, Copyright)
- Issued claims for 76,646 outstanding books (71,929 issued via ECIP system; 4,717 paper claims mailed to publishers)
- Pre-assigned 28,290 LCCNs via the EPCN program.

2. Bibliographic Access Divisions Strategic Plan requires the CIP Division to in effect justify the CIP and PCN programs. LC managers and staff see both programs as draining limited resources that would be better applied to the processing of materials that more clearly and consistently meet LC collection development policies. Also, Acquisitions staff believes that the PCN program in particular brings into LC books not wanted for the collection.

- CIP will do a survey in an effort to re-examine basic rationale for CIP and PCN. Celli noted that given limited resources in CIP to do this survey, the survey might be limited to library community. Several CAG members, however, discouraged this approach and urged survey efforts to include all stakeholders: publishers, book vendors, and bibliographic utilities.
- Survey will very likely be online only because of costs associated with a paper survey mailed to respondents. CAG members generally supported this online survey approach.
- Survey will likely include:
  1. Scope and eligibility questions: type of work, type of books, type of publisher to include in CIP
  2. Data questions
    - a) Traditional CIP data elements
    - b) Additional data elements
    - c) A different or alternative record, e.g., New Books record or enhanced PCN record (a non-catalog record derived from publisher-provided data)
  3. Distribution/Service questions, eg., how to make the record available
    - a) Do we need CIP data in the book?
    - b) Electronic distribution of data direct to libraries pushed or pulled
    - c) Format of data:
      - MARC
      - XML
      - PDP
      - METS
      - MODS
      - ONIX

NOTE: CIP has established a listserv for all CAG members, friends, and subscribers. We will use this listserv to solicit input as we develop the survey.

3. September 28, 2004 Publishers Meeting (see handout). Most publishers were big publishers. A wide range of issues were covered:

- Publisher in-house systems often unique to a given firm's culture
- Publishers desire to send PDF and ONIX files to LC for both Copyright and CIP.
- Possibility of submitting an electronic or PDF copy to meet CIP requirements for a copy of each book for which CIP data was provided
- Discussion of value of name authorities to both publishers and libraries
- Publishers moving to more on-demand publishing to maintain small inventories

4. ISBN-13 (see handout)

## 5. Publisher-provided Summaries Project (see handout)

- Experiment has been very successful - quality of summaries very high
- They provide concise statement of book's content
- They provide additional keywords for searching
- They facilitate the cataloging process
- Over 450 summaries received with 21 rejected
- Guidelines require summaries to be 50 words or less, objective, and clear. No obscene or profane language
- CIP uses the summary as is or deletes it. There is no editing of publisher-provided summaries
- TCEC now puts the summary automatically in the record. The cataloger needs only to delete the summary if it is unacceptable.

## 6. Demo of new online publishers manual. Provides immediate access to full technical and policy information regarding the CIP Program.

[We did not have time to demo the new online publishers manual. Perhaps we can do this at the next CAG meeting.]

## 7. Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC)/CIP Cataloging Project

- The aim of this project to explore the possibility of establishing select PCC libraries to catalog CIPs similar to the way clinical medical titles are cataloged at LC. Currently, clinical medical titles are received and processed via the ECIP system and are cataloged by both LC and NLM. The CIPs are received and reviewed for eligibility and technical functionality, and assigned an LCCN by LC. The CIPs are then forwarded to NLM electronically via the ECIP system. As NLM is set up as a virtual LC cataloging team, they can sign-on to and access the electronic text and application of each CIP via the ECIP Traffic Manager. NLM staff processes the CIP with TCEC and forwards the CIP to the LC Cataloging team responsible for adding LCSH headings. When the work is completed it is forwarded to the CIP Publisher Liaison Team, and the completed CIP data is emailed to the publisher.
- Libraries that may be candidates for this project have these characteristics:
  - a) PCC participant
  - b) Voyager library
  - c) Are associated with a press (eg., Cornell & Cornell University Press, Northwestern & Northwestern University Press)
- A pilot will soon start with Cornell and Northwestern. The following elements were discussed and agreed to by representatives of the two institutions and the CIP Division:

### **Cornell**

#### Cornell -

- will provide LC a list of local fields
- will do full descriptive and subject cataloging
- will provide LC classification number (050 subfield “a”)
- will accept series treatment on LC Series Authority Records
- will not provide a full LC call number
- will not provide a Dewey number
- will not perform CIP verification

#### LC -

- will send Validator to Cornell
- will modify TCEC to accommodate Cornell local fields
- will complete LC call number (providing the 050 subfield “b”)
- will provide Dewey number
- will perform CIP verification

### **Northwestern**

#### Northwestern -

- will not provide any part of the LC call number
- will provide Dewey number

#### LC -

- will provide full LC call number (050 subfields “a” and “b”)
- will accept Northwestern’s Dewey number
- Both Cornell and Northwestern have agreed to experiment with this project. To facilitate this implementation:
  - LC will develop a cheat-sheet mapping subject headings and/or classification numbers to LC cataloging teams for use in ECIP Traffic Manager (routing ECIPs from Cornell & Northwestern to the appropriate cataloging team)
  - must test to see if there are any firewall issues?
  - need FTP site defined

#### 8. ECIP demonstrations

- Demo of front-end of the ECIP system. This is the module publishers access and use to complete the CIP data application form and then attach the text of the forthcoming text in order to request CIP data for a given title.
- Demo of ECIP Traffic Manager. This is the module that LC staff and project participants use to access the submitted application and text, open and read the text, and move the application and text to appropriate cataloging teams.
- Demo of TCEC (Text Capture and Electronic Conversion). This is the module that catalogers evoke from within the Traffic Manager and which facilitates the cataloging process by enabling the cataloger to readily create much of the catalog record by simply highlighting appropriate data elements of the title page and choosing the appropriate MARC tag button to populate the bibliographic record.

## 9. Highlights of IFLA CIP Survey results:

[We did not have time to review the IFLA survey results but highlights follow. See: <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cipsurvey/> for a copy of the IFLA report.]

- 42 libraries responded to the survey
- 25 have active CIP programs
- 3 have plans to start CIP programs
- Total records produced annual by CIP programs: 188,892
- Collectively 25 programs catalog in more than 24 languages
- 18 libraries distribute data in machine-readable form
- 9 programs are decentralized
- Unlike the U.S. CIP program,
  - 6 do serials
  - 7 do musical scores
  - 11 do e-books
  - 4 do audio tapes/discs/cassettes
  - 2 do video tapes/discs/cassettes
  - 1 includes Web homepages (Slovenia)
- 14 require CIP Data printed in the book